UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,252	03/17/2004	Ullas Gargi	200300480-1	5961

22879 7590 04/09/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
DANG, HUNG Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2621	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,252	GARGI, ULLAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. DANG	2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/17/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/28/2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-35, and 37-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jojic et al. (US Patent 7,152,209) and Amir et al. (US Patent 6,907,570).

Regarding claim 1, Jojic et al. disclose a method for variable speed video playback (column 2, lines 11-23), comprising: obtaining a set of scores for a plurality of discrete segments in a digital video (column 24, lines 10-22); enabling a playback of said digital video at a variable playback speed that may change from segment to segment based on said set of scores (column 12, lines 13-22); receiving a user input to adjust said playback speed for at least one of said segments by modifying at least one of said set of scores (column 11, lines 50-53; column 28, line 66 – column 29, line 1); and adjusting said variable playback speed based on said user input (column 12, lines 8-22; column 24, lines 10-23; column 24, lines 29-39).

However, Jojic et al. do not disclose adjusting including reversing said variable playback speed.

Amir et al. disclose reversing a variable playback speed (column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 4).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the reversing the variable playback speed disclosed by Amir et al. into the adjusting step disclosed by Jojic et al. in order to enhance the user interface of the method because if user wants to view backward, he or she doesn't have to start over from the beginning but instead it can be conducted at the current point.

Regarding claim 2, Jojic et al. also disclose said scores were computed based on one or more video analysis techniques applied to said segments (column 19, line 59 – column 20, line 26).

Regarding claim 3, Jojic et al. also disclose different ones of said video analysis techniques are given different weights in computing said set of scores (column 20, lines 3-56).

Regarding claim 4, Jojic et al. also disclose said weight for said video analysis technique is given prior to performing said video analysis technique (column 20, lines 3-56 – the function to calculate the likelihood is determined prior to performing the video analysis technique).

Regarding claim 5, Jojic et al. also disclose said weight for said video analysis technique is given after performing said video analysis technique (column 13, lines 24-27; column 20, lines 2-56; the number of blobs is inputted dynamically; the extra blobs

or reduced blobs have weights increased from zero to non-zero or from non-zero to zero, respectively).

Regarding claim 7, Jojic et al. also disclose adjusting includes increasing the weight of a video analysis technique if that technique substantially differentiates among said segments (column 21, lines 25-33).

Regarding claim 8, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to modify said weight given to at least one of said video analysis techniques (column 13, lines 24-27; column 20, lines 2-56; the number of blobs is inputted dynamically; the extra blobs or reduced blobs have weights increased from zero to non-zero or from non-zero to zero, respectively).

Regarding claim 9, Jojic et al. also disclose said enabling includes playing a discrete segment of said digital video at a slower speed when said discrete segment has a high score relative to scores for other discrete segments of said digital video (column 24, lines 19-23).

Regarding claim 10, Jojic et al. also disclose said enabling includes playing a discrete segment of said digital video at a faster speed when said discrete segment has a low score relative to scores for other discrete segments of said digital video (column 24, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 11, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to dampen an effect of said set of scores on said variable playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 12, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes an instruction to amplify an effect of said set of scores on said variable playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 13, Jojic et al. also disclose said adjusting includes recalculating said variable playback speed based on said input (column 11, lines 50-53; column 28, line 66 – column 29, line 1; column 24, lines 10-23).

Regarding claim 14, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes setting a maximum playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49; by dragging the "slider bar 1350" in Fig. 13 up to the right most position).

Regarding claim 15, Jojic et al. also disclose said user input includes setting an average playback speed (column 16, lines 41-49; by dragging the "slider bar 1350" in Fig. 13 up to a mid-point position).

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above in further consideration of Jojic et al. also disclosing a user interface module configured to provide said user input to said video playback module (column 27, lines 45-51; "slider bar 1390" in Fig. 13).

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 20 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 10 above.

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 11 above.

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 12 above.

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 14 above.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 15 above.

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 13 above.

Regarding claim 29, Jojic et al. also disclose an output device configured to display past and future discrete segments in one or more sliding windows (column 12, lines 27-50; column 38, lines 2-11, 18-29).

Regarding claim 30, Jojic et al. also disclose an output device configured to enable a user selection of one or more past and future discrete segments (column 12, lines 27-50; column 38, lines 2-11, 18-29).

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 32 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 30 above.

Claim 33 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claim 34 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 2 above.

Claim 35 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above.

Claim 37 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 7 above.

Claim 38 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 39 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 40 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 10 above.

Claim 41 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 11 above.

Claim 42 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 12 above.

Claim 43 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 14 above.

Claim 44 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 15 above.

Claim 45 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 13 above.

Claims 6, 19, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jojic et al. (US Patent 7,512,209) and Amir et al. (US Patent 6,907,570) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-35, and 37-45 above, and further in view of Breese et al. (US Patent 6,144,964).

Regarding claim 6, see the teachings of Jojic et al. as discussed in claim 3 above. However, Jojic et al. do not disclose reducing the weight of an analysis technique if that technique fails to substantially differentiate among said segments.

Breese et al. disclose a tuning technique that reduces the weight of the component that fail to substantially differentiate among other components (abstract).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the tuning technique disclosed by Breese et al. into the method disclosed by Jojic et al. to enhance the accuracy of the method.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

Claim 36 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 6 above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. DANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th:7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung Q Dang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621